

Date: Mon, 10 May 93 04:30:26 PDT  
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>  
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu  
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu  
Precedence: Bulk  
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V93 #135  
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest                      Mon, 10 May 93                      Volume 93 : Issue 135

Today's Topics:

Cellular capable scanners...Buy'em Whil  
    More on no-code (4 msgs)  
    no-code defense (3 msgs)  
    sick of it all

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>  
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>  
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available  
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text  
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official  
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

-----

Date: Mon, 10 May 1993 01:09:36 GMT  
From: walter!qualcom.qualcomm.com!unix.ka9q.ampr.org!karn@uunet.uu.net  
Subject: Cellular capable scanners...Buy'em Whil  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

If you really want to build a cellular scanner, just take a UHF TV tuner,  
run the output into a lowband VHF scanner, and scan the IF. Trivial.

|> |P.S. you know how the new regs say that scanners can't contain circuitry to  
|> |decode digital cellular signals? How about having a plug-in PC board  
|> |decode the output of a scanner? Could this be done? These new regs are  
|> |challenging, eh?

As Tsutomu Shimomura demonstrated to the House Subcommittee on  
Telecommunications and Finance the other week, the very best cellular  
"scanner" is an actual cell phone with hacked firmware. He says the  
hardest part is finding the right screwdriver to take off the screws.

Phil

-----  
Date: Sun, 9 May 1993 13:26:55 GMT  
From: usc!howland.reston.ans.net!gatech!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary@network.UCSD.EDU  
Subject: More on no-code  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <930507.233722.8k1.rusnews.w165w@garlic.sbs.com> system@garlic.sbs.com  
(Anthony S. Pelliccio) writes:

```
>> If  
>> it was required that all programmers become proficient in assembler before  
>> being allowed to enter the "brotherhood/sisterhood" of computer programmers -  
>> the number of programmers would diminish - but that would again keep out  
>> most of the scumbag PCers.  
>  
>Bzzzzzt! Bad argument. That's why a base PC today has to have at least  
>8Mb of RAM, 210Mb of HD space and whole bunch of other crap. Because of  
>these so-called "High-Level" languages we've got some serious garbage  
>for software. Just look at Microsoft for a perfect example. :)
```

Software bloat is a common complaint, but without higher level languages today's complex applications, that work the way the user wants to work, not how the computer wants to work, wouldn't be filling software store's shelves. Time to market would lengthen from today's under six months to several years, cross platform applications would be rare, and code maintenance would be an absolute nightmare. When I started programming, every T cycle had to be counted, instructions had to be strategically placed on the rotating drum, card decks and teletypes were the I/O devices, and no one, including me, could figure out what a routine was doing when it needed upgrading six months down the road. Today's cheap hardware has allowed us to use higher level languages to write complex, and maintainable, applications before the market niche disappears. Cheap and available high level language tools have played as important a part as the microprocessor itself in making desktop computers standard equipment in every office instead of some behemoth hunk of iron hidden in DP and worshipped by a small elite priesthood who might condescend to do a user application 2 years after it became irrelevant to the user.

Gary

```
--  
Gary Coffman KE4ZV          | You make it,      | gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary  
Destructive Testing Systems | we break it.     | uunet!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary  
534 Shannon Way           | Guaranteed!      | emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary  
Lawrenceville, GA 30244   |                   |
```

-----

Date: Sun, 9 May 1993 13:08:48 GMT

From: usc!howland.reston.ans.net!gatech!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary@network.UCSD.EDU

Subject: More on no-code

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <1993May7.174540.14265@leland.Stanford.EDU> paulf@umunhum.stanford.edu (Paul Flaherty) writes:

>

>If this analogy had any validity, then CW usage would have first disappeared  
>with the development of AM voice, and most certainly would have died with the  
>widespread use of SSB. The simple matter of fact is that of the two manual  
>modulation schemes available to human beings (voice and morse code), CW is  
>about 25 times as spectrally efficient on a per - user basis. From a  
>historical perspective, it's about a decade older than voice, but that's  
>hardly criteria for antequation.

Unlike unregulated computer operating systems, government regulations limited the use of voice to two small segments of the HF bands when it was first introduced. Even when SSB came into widespread use, half the HF spectrum was off limits to the mode by Federal regulation. That mandated spectrum preserve, rather than the spectral efficiency of CW, is what's retarded the decline of CW on HF. At VHF and above this spectrum segregation has never been an issue and CW is a speciality mode that sees limited use.

Manual CW does have some advantages, as well as some serious drawbacks, and it will remain in use for a long time for certain specialty operating niches. But it doesn't demonstrate in practice it's theoretical bandwidth savings. Most CW contacts still space at least a kilohertz apart, and complaints from CW operators are long and loud when any other mode attempts to share spectrum with them. Also spectrum is shared by law in the time as well as the frequency domain. The higher thruput of other modes can use the spectrum as efficiently, if not more so, than manual CW by occupying spectrum for a lesser time for the same message content. With most CW operator's actual speeds hovering around 15 WPM, and with RTTY at 60 WPM, AMTOR at about 30 WPM, and HF packet on a good day going 12 WPM, and speech at 120 WPM, CW only beats one of the other modes in raw speed for transferring information. When you look in terms of WPM/Hz/sec, CW falls toward the back of the pack except for a very few exceptional operators under exceptional conditions.

CW remains dominant for very weak signal work among amateurs, but the professionals have long discarded it for better methods. Those techniques are now becoming cheap enough to filter into the amateur ranks. I won't be at all surprised to see SS or MSK, coupled with FEC, become the dominant method of working moonbounce in the next few years. In fact, I expect to see modest stations running less than 100 watts achieving routine moonbounce contacts in the next decade using these advanced methods.

Unlike spark, CW is not yet dead, but it's near universal use has come to an end and it's become just another specialty mode available to amateurs who are willing to do extensive wetware programming in lieu of other hardware/software approaches. It can no longer claim technical superiority over other modes.

Gary

--

Gary Coffman KE4ZV		You make it,		gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary
Destructive Testing Systems		we break it.		uunet!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary
534 Shannon Way		Guaranteed!		emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary
Lawrenceville, GA 30244				

-----

Date: Mon, 10 May 1993 07:33:29 GMT

From: pa.dec.com!nntpd2.cxo.dec.com!nuts2u.enet.dec.com!little@decwrl.dec.com

Subject: More on no-code

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

gary@ke4zv.uucp (Gary Coffman) writes:

>Software bloat is a common complaint, but without higher level languages  
>today's complex applications, that work the way the user wants to work,  
>not how the computer wants to work, wouldn't be filling software store's  
>shelves. Time to market would lengthen from today's under six months to  
>several years, cross platform applications would be rare, and code  
>maintenance would be an absolute nightmare. When I started programming,  
>every T cycle had to be counted, instructions had to be strategically  
>placed on the rotating drum, card decks and teletypes were the I/O  
>devices, and no one, including me, could figure out what a routine  
>was doing when it needed upgrading six months down the road. Today's  
>cheap hardware has allowed us to use higher level languages to write  
>complex, and maintainable, applications before the market niche disappears.  
>Cheap and available high level language tools have played as important  
>a part as the microprocessor itself in making desktop computers standard  
>equipment in every office instead of some behemoth hunk of iron hidden  
>in DP and worshipped by a small elite priesthood who might condescend  
>to do a user application 2 years after it became irrelevant to the user.

Well there is an obvious solution to this decline in the priesthood. Let's push for government regulation of programming and force every programmer to demonstrate their ability to optimize software for today's heavily pipelined machines. I'd suggest demonstration of being able to hand optimize instruction order and branch execution for Alpha, MIPS, and the Pentium as minimum prerequisites to getting a novice programmers license. I had to do that for the display systems I was working on 20 years ago so these young whiners that are getting into the profession without even

knowing what a branch is ought to have to do it. What you say, the purpose of programming isn't building the priesthood but solving problems? Nonsense, it's the priesthood that counts. After all, I put in the effort. It would devalue the effort I made all those years ago to require anything less.

73,  
Todd  
N9MWB

PS For the humor impaired, please read in a heavy dose of sarcasm.

-----  
Date: Sun, 09 May 93 23:43:24 PDT  
From: amdahl!grafex!ka6etb@uunet.uu.net  
Subject: More on no-code  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

little@nuts2u.enet.dec.com (nuts2u::little) writes:

> Well there is an obvious solution to this decline in the priesthood. Let's  
> push for government regulation of programming and force every programmer to  
> demonstrate their ability to optimize software for today's heavily  
> pipelined machines.

You say this in jest, but I recall such an effort attempted by a state government (NY, NJ?). Something about being a certified programmer.

Anybody else remember this?

s

-----  
Date: Sun, 09 May 93 02:33:46 CDT  
From: usc!zaphod.mps.ohio-state.edu!menudo.uh.edu!jpunix!unkaphaed!amanda!robert@network.UCSD.EDU  
Subject: no-code defense  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

little@nuts2u.enet.dec.com (nuts2u::little) writes:

> kd1hz@anomaly.sbs.com (Rev. Michael P. Deignan) writes:  
>  
> >little@nuts2u.enet.dec.com (nuts2u::little) writes:  
> >  
> >>I travel a fair amount and

> >>typically take a dual band rig with me. I've yet to hear these  
> >>problems you speak about.  
>  
> >Obviously you don't visit Rhode dYland[sic] all that much.  
>  
> Fortunately for me. Otherwise I might have to listen to the drivel of your  
> followers. Perhaps the Reverend Deignan could take his band of misfits to  
> Waco TX, and try for a second coming. Gosh, I wish I could have such a  
> dedicated following. Will they commit suicide for you too?  
>  
> >For one reason, it is difficult to convey as much information via CW  
> >in the same amount of time that you can via voice.  
>  
> Strange, others have stated that it is conversational in nature. Certainly a  
> the speeds that the elite members of the Rhode Island 2x2 Amateur Repeater  
> Association must be able to copy.  
>  
> >>As far as I can tell, the only thing incentive licensing has done is  
> >>create a class of operators who think they're better than everyone  
> >>else.  
> >  
> >But, we are. That's why we're in the Rhode Island 2x2 Amateur Repeater  
> >Association, and you are not. Unless, of course, you wish to pay the  
> >\$4,000 no-code membership fee, submit the 5,000 word essay on why you  
> >want to be a member, and take the 100 question oral examination on  
> >license-class relevant information from Part 97 and the ARRL  
> >handbook.  
>  
> This is great. I love it. Join a repeater association in Rhode Island  
> with you guys as members? I don't think you could \*PAY\* anyone \$4,000 to  
> join.  
>  
> >But, as is consistent with your type, I'm sure you just memorized the  
> >question pools, and really don't remember all that much about "theory"  
> >anyway...  
>  
> OH wow, what a cut. I'm bleeding from your rapier wit.  
>  
> >>That's probably why they keep their postings in  
> >>rec.radio.amateur.misc.  
> >  
> >No, just that .policy is a bandwidth deadzone.  
>  
> Yeah besides, that would be a demonstration of common courtesy and you  
> wouldn't want to do that. You even put the follow up as  
> rec.radio.amateur.misc. How kind.  
>  
> Great arguments. I haven't had this difficult a time debating a topic

> since I was in second grade.  
>  
> 73,  
> Todd  
> N9MWB

Todd, please stop whining. Simply upgrade your class of amateur ticket, and your problem is solved. We have gone over this ground again and again, and you are accomplishing nothing. If you spent just half the time working on your upgrade as you do pounding on your keyboard, you would have the class you desire, and this would be a moot argument.

-Robert WA3J

-----  
Date: 10 May 1993 02:38:03 GMT  
From: ucsd.edu!brian@network.UCSD.EDU  
Subject: no-code defense  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

I begin to suspect that this 'ASP' person is really just posting flame bait and doesn't believe what he's saying - just trying to get a rise out of people who wouldn't talk to him for any other reason.

Next we'll hear the old USENET refrain: excuse number 43: "I was just trying an experiment to see what people would say"

Blecch.  
- Brian

-----  
Date: Mon, 10 May 1993 07:33:36 GMT  
From: pa.dec.com!nntpd2.cxo.dec.com!nuts2u.enet.dec.com!little@decwrl.dec.com  
Subject: no-code defense  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

robert@amanda.jpunix.com (robert) writes:

>Todd, please stop whining. Simply upgrade your class of amateur ticket,  
>and your problem is solved. We have gone over this ground again and  
>again, and you are accomplishing nothing. If you spent just half the time  
>working on your upgrade as you do pounding on your keyboard, you would  
>have the class you desire, and this would be a moot argument[sic].

Thank you for the advice, but it's moot as I already did upgrade. As I stated before, this is supposed to be a rational debate, but those like

yourself appear to want to discount the argument as whining so you don't need to present a counter argument. Nice try. Listen before you speak. It's great advice on the air, and equally as applicable on the usenet.

Also, to stand by and accept the condescending drive1 from the sbs gang is to agree with it. I certainly hope there are many who find the comments emanating from the sbs nodes obnoxious and uncharacteristic of the amateur radio community. Certainly in Chicago I have yet to hear one remark even closely resembling the invectives spewing forth from \*.sbs.com. Like I said, glad I'm in Chicago and not Providence.

73,  
Todd  
N9MWB

-----  
Date: Mon, 10 May 1993 07:57:55 GMT  
From: pa.dec.com!nntpd2.cxo.dec.com!nuts2u.enet.dec.com!little@decwrl.dec.com  
Subject: sick of it all  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

system@garlic.sbs.com (Anthony S. Pelliccio) writes:

>little@nuts2u.enet.dec.com (nuts2u::little) writes:

>  
>> It's funny that the EEOC and courts went out of their way to eliminate  
>> capricious and irrelevant testing for the purposes of employment, yet the  
>> FCC apparently feels that those are valuable attributes for its testing  
>> efforts. Strange too that the FCC move to this absurd "incentive"  
>> licensing structure occurred about the same time employment testing and  
>> selection became really popular. The EEOC saw the absurdity of it, but I  
>> guess they never let the FCC know about it.

>Having been fully EEOC trained I can say it's mostly a crock. Then  
>again, anything government sticks its nose into is a crock. Besides, it  
>has nothing to do with amateur radio. Prove to me how EEOC applies to  
>amateur radio. We don't discriminate based upon race, color, sex,  
>handicap, etc, or any of the other things EEOC mentions. But since they  
>don't mention morse code... you're pretty well screwed. So think before  
>you post.

So astute of you to notice the EEOC doesn't mention Morse code. Did I say they did? I said they realized the absurdity of capricious and irrelevant testing and essentially prohibited it for employment purposes. This meant you could no longer give someone a typing test to determine whether you would hire them as a truck driver. Sounds similar to requiring a Morse code test to grant someone phone privileges? The EEOC may have gone



overboard in what they defined as prima facie evidence sufficient to shift the burden of proof from the plaintiff to the defendant. But it was their stance on irrelevant testing at about the same time the FCC was further institutionalizing irrelevant tests that I find peculiar. But as you said, the government can screw anything up.

73,  
Todd  
N9MWB

-----  
Date: Mon, 10 May 1993 04:07:23 GMT  
From: news.Hawaii.Edu!uhunix.uhcc.Hawaii.Edu!jherman@ames.arpa  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1993May7.143537.12466@rsg1.er.usgs.gov>,  
<1993May7.174540.14265@leland.Stanford.EDU>, <1993May9.130848.4228@ke4zv.uucp>  
Subject : Re: More on no-code

In article <1993May9.130848.4228@ke4zv.uucp> gary@ke4zv.UUCP (Gary Coffman) writes:

>  
>CW remains dominant for very weak signal work among amateurs, but the  
>professionals have long discarded it for better methods. Those techniques  
>  
>Gary

You're very wrong, Gary; the professionals have not discarded CW. Please tune your general coverage receiver to the maritime frequencies in the 4, 6, 8, 12, 16, 22, and 25 MHz marine bands (I can provide you with the actual frequencies if you'd like). Shipboard and coastal station traffic is STILL passed using CW: weather broadcasts, distress traffic, navigation warnings, periodic position reports, all go CW; every 6 hours, every ship in the world sends it observed weather to a shore station via CW.

Jeff NH6IL

Jeffrey Herman, University of Hawaii Mathematics, jherman@hawaii.edu

-----  
Date: Mon, 10 May 1993 01:23:19 GMT  
From: walter!qualcom.qualcomm.com!unix.ka9q.ampr.org!karn@uunet.uu.net  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1sbv74INNogc@chnews.intel.com>,  
<1993May6.215752.856@nnntp2.cxo.dec.com>,  
<1993May6.232502.17749@leland.Stanford.EDU>  
Reply-To : karn@servo.qualcomm.com  
Subject : Re: sick of it all

In article <1993May6.232502.17749@leland.Stanford.EDU>, paulf@umunhum.stanford.edu  
(Paul Flaherty) writes:

|> Quite simply, the fairest way to ration anything is to allocate more of that  
|> thing to people who are willing to use it most efficiently. That's the way  
|> the current system works.

Then perhaps the FCC should limit HF access to those using Clover.  
It's about the most efficient HF modulation technique around, and the  
(currently) high cost should preclude congestion for some time.

Phil

-----

End of Ham-Policy Digest V93 #135

\*\*\*\*\*